

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 28-30 and 34-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of “Intermediaries: New Places for Producing and Manipulating Web Content,” by Barrett et al. (“Barrett”) in view U.S. Patent No. 6,681,327 to Jardin (“Jardin”); rejected claims 31, 32, 38, and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view Barrett and Jardin, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,598,167 to Devine et al. (“Devine”); and rejected claims 33 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Barrett, Jardin, Devine, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,752,022 to Chiu et al. (“Chiu”).

By this amendment, claims 28 and 34 have been amended to more appropriately define the invention. Support for the amendments to these claims can be found at, for example, page 18, lines 17-28 and page 34, lines 1-18 of the originally filed specification. Claims 28-40 are currently pending.

For the following reasons, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claims 28-30 and 34-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Barrett and Jardin.

Independent claim 28, as amended, is directed to an information retrieval system that retrieves information requested by a client machine from a remote server via a network, the client machine operating a network browser. The system includes, among other things, an intermediate server and at least one application plug-in installed on the intermediate server, the application plug-in to alter the data obtained on behalf of the client machine. As is further recited in claim 28, the intermediate server returns the altered data to the client machine via the SSL connection as a HTML document for display by the network browser of the client machine, the intermediate server inserting at least one toolbar into the HTML document before returning the HTML document to the client, the toolbar providing controls to functionality provided by the intermediate server.

Neither Barrett nor Jardin, either alone or in combination, disclose or suggest each of the features recited in amended claim 28. For example, neither Barrett nor Jardin discloses or suggests the intermediate server recited in claim 28, which inserts at least one toolbar into an HTML document before returning the HTML document to the client, the toolbar providing controls to functionality provided by the intermediate server. Barrett describes web “intermediaries” as computational elements that lie along the path of a web transaction. (Barrett, Abstract). The web intermediaries of Barrett, however, are not disclosed or suggested as inserting at least one toolbar into an HTML document before returning the HTML document to the client, the toolbar providing controls to functionality provided by the intermediate server, as recited in amended claim 28.

Jardin describes techniques for managing secure client-server transactions. (Jardin, Title and Abstract). Jardin, however, like Barrett, does not disclose or suggest inserting at least one toolbar into an HTML document before returning the HTML document to the client, the toolbar providing controls to functionality provided by an intermediate server. Accordingly, because neither Barrett nor Jardin individually disclose this feature of claim 28, Barrett and Jardin, even if combined, could not disclose this feature of claim 28.

For at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 28 is improper and should be withdrawn. The rejections of claims 29 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Barrett and Jardin are also improper and should be withdrawn, at least by virtue of the dependency of these claims from claim 28.

Independent claim 34 and its dependent claims 35-37 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Barrett and Jardin. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of these claims.

Amended independent claim 34 is directed to an intermediary server device comprising a web server, a handler, and a parser. The parser is operatively coupled to the handler and receives

resources supplied by the remote servers in response to modified requests and alters the resources to include at least one toolbar that provides controls to functionality provided by the web server.

Neither Barrett nor Jardin, either alone or in combination, disclose or suggest each of the features recited in amended claim 34. For example, neither reference discloses or suggests the parser recited in claim 34, which receives resources supplied by remote servers and alters the resources to include at least one toolbar that provides controls to functionality provided by the web server. As previously mentioned, Barrett describes web intermediaries. The web intermediaries of Barrett, however, are not disclosed or suggested as altering resources supplied by remote servers to include at least one toolbar that provides controls to functionality provided by the web server, as recited in claim 34. Jardin, like Barrett, also does not disclose or suggest this aspect of claim 34. Accordingly, because neither Barrett nor Jardin individually disclose this feature of claim 34, Barrett and Jardin, even if combined, could not possibly disclose this feature of claim 34.

For at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 34 is improper and should be withdrawn. The rejections of claims 35-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Barrett and Jardin are also improper and should be withdrawn, at least by virtue of the dependency of these claims from claim 34.

Dependent claims 31, 32, 38, and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Barrett and Jardin, and further in view of Devine. Applicants respectfully submit that Devine does not cure the above-discussed deficiencies of Barrett and Jardin with respect to claims 28 and 34. Accordingly, the rejections of claims 31 and 32, which depend from claim 28, and claims 38 and 39, which depend from claim 34, are improper and should be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 33 and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Barrett, Jardin, Devine, and further in view of Chiu. Applicants respectfully submit that Chiu does not

cure the above-discussed deficiencies of Barrett, Jardin, and Devine with respect to claims 31 and 38. Accordingly, the rejections of claims 33 and 40, which depend from claim 31 and 38, respectively, are improper and should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration of this application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1070 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

Harrity Snyder, L.L.P.

By: /Brian E. Ledell/
Brian E. Ledell
Reg. No. 42,784

11350 Random Hills Road
Suite 600
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
(571) 432-0800
Customer No.: 44987

Date: July 10, 2006